A VINDICATION OF THE ANSWER TO THE POPISH ADDRESS

Presented to the

Ministers of the Church of *England.*

In Reply to a Pamphlet abusively Intituled, *A Clear Proof of the Certainty and Usefulness of the Protestant Rule of Faith*, &c.

IMPRIMATUR,

Liber cui Titulus, [*A Vindication of the Answer to the Addresses*, &c.]

April 26. 1688.

Guil. Needham RR. in Christo P. ac D. D. *Wilhelmo* Archiep. *Cant.* à Sacr. Domest.

LONDON:

Printed for **Ric. Chiswell**, at the *Rose* and *Crown* in St. *Paul's* Church-Yard. MDCLXXXVIII

A VINDICATION OF THE ANSWER To the POPISH ADDRESS, &c.

A Clear Proof of the Certainty and Uſefulneſs of the Proteſtant Rule of Faith, *Scripture*, after the Help of *Miniſterial Guides*, finally Interpreted by *each Man's* private Senſe. Clear Proof.

A Title ſeemingly belonging to a Proteſtant Book, and a Book wrote by a Proteſtant, if the Title and Book do agree: But that they are ſo far from, that if Truth and Ability had been on the Author's ſide, it might have been more truly call'd, with reſpect to his Deſign, *A clear Diſproof of the Certainty*, &c. *Vindication.*

But why ſo much Caution? Why is not the *Addreſs* or *Anſwer* to it, ſo much as named in the Title? We are left to gueſs; and becauſe every man may in ſuch a caſe uſe his liberty, I could upon Peruſal of his Book, gueſs at no reaſon ſooner, than that the *Prover* was not very confident of the ſufficiency of his Defence, and might by ſuch a clandeſtine Title, ſecure himſelf againſt a further Reply; unleſs his Adverſary had nothing elſe to do than to read all the Pamphlets printed by *H. H.*; or ſome un-

lucky Chance ſhould make the Diſcovery. And to ſay the truth, the *Prover* might have ſucceeded in his Deſign, and have triumphed in the Victory he had thus ſecretly ſtollen, had not a little Accident, though ſomewhat late firſt, brought it under his Adverſary's eye.

Clear Proof. This proof is drawn from the Anſwer to the Addreſs preſented to the *Miniſters of the Church of England.* The Author thereof had required that clear and plain Texts of Scripture be offer'd, which interpreted in the *Proteſtant way*, by thoſe who receive it thus expounded for their whole Rule of Faith, ſhould ſo prove the two principal Articles of Chriſtian Belief, the *Trinity* and the *Incarnation* of *Chriſt*; as alſo the Obligation of keeping holy the *Sunday*, and not *Saturday*, as one of the Commandments ſeems to require; and that ſo convincingly, that a *Chriſtian* might ground on them his Faith. Interpreted, I ſay, in the Proteſtant-way, without any *deciding* Church-Authority when doubts ariſe about the ſenſe of the Letter.

Vindication. The *Prover*'s Deſign is to expoſe the Proteſtant Rule of Faith, and to that end, becauſe he had no better way, is forced to Miſrepreſent it. For thus he ſaith, *Scripture interpreted in the Proteſtant way, is received by them, thus expounded, for their whole Rule of Faith.* But he well knew, or ſhould know, that the Scripture is with Proteſtants, a *Rule of Faith* as it's the Word of God, and their *whole* Rule of Faith, as it's the only Word of God, and ſo is as uncapable of taking in any humane Expoſition to be a part of that Rule, as it is of any new Revelation. That is, the Scripture depends not upon the ſenſe given it by any man, or Order of men for its being thus a Rule, but upon its own Authority.

But he ventures a little further by way of Explication. *Scripture*, ſaith he, *interpreted in the Proteſtant way, without any deciding Church-Authority, when doubts ariſe about the Senſe of the Letter.*

But ſuppoſing there are no *doubts about the ſenſe of the Letter*; then it ſeems there is in that caſe no uſe of any ſuch *deciding Authority*, and that we may be certain of the ſenſe of the Letter without ſuch Authority. If ſo, then it would be known of what kind that Certainty is, which may be attained without ſuch Authority, and whether it be not attained by the uſe of Reaſon and Underſtanding; and ſo is at laſt reſolved into what he decries, *Private Senſe.*

But.

But put the caſe as he would have it, and ſuppoſing there be a *doubt about the ſenſe of the Letter*, I demand whether we may not by the like uſe of our Reaſon, arrive to the ſame ſort of certainty in the things we now doubt of, as we have arrived to in the things we are at preſent certain of, without any *deciding Church-Authority*? As for example: Suppoſe a *doubt ariſeth* about this deciding Church-Authority it ſelf, how ſhall the doubt be decided? If we ſeek to the *deciding Church-Authority*, that is the thing in queſtion; if we repair to the Scripture, the Senſe of that is to be declared and determined by the *deciding Church-Authority*; and if we take any other meaſures for underſtanding it, we fall into the dangerous and abhorr'd extreme, of *finally interpreting it by private Senſe*: So that either the matter is uncapable of proof, and muſt be taken for granted; and there is a *deciding Church-Authority* becauſe there is ſo: or elſe if it be to be proved, it muſt be by the ſame way that other things are proved in, and that is by producing the Reaſons for it, and according to the Judgment made upon it thereby, it's ultimately to be decided. And then farewel to the *deciding Church-Authority*, when in a matter of ſo great Conſequence, and the firſt Point to be reſolved in, it muſt be ſubmitted to *each mans private Senſe*.

The Addreſſer holds, (if he be a Catholick) That Scripture, rightly underſtood, is a *Rule of Faith*; That the *Goſpel* revealed by Chriſt, preached by the *Apoſtles*, and preſerved by the Catholick Church, is ſo much our *whole Rule of Faith*, that we own with *Tertullian*, *we need not be curiouſly ſearching ſince Chriſt, nor further inquiſitive ſince the Goſpel was preached.* No new Revelations, no new Articles, being received as of Catholick Faith; but thoſe Truths only retained, which the Church propoſes as delivered to her by the Apoſtles, her whole authority being ever employed, as Pope *Celeſtine* delivers it to the Council of *Epheſus*, in *providing that what was delivered, and preſerved in a continual Succeſſion from the Apoſtles, be retained*; ſo that *nothing is of Faith, but what God revealed by the Prophets and the Apoſtles, or what evidently follows from it*; the Catholick Church ever handing it to us, and declaring it to be ſo. Clear Proof. *De Præſc.* *Ep.* 7.

The Goſpel revealed by Chriſt, preached by the Apoſtles, and preſerved by the Catholick Church, is their whole Rule of Faith. ——— *No new Revelations, no new Articles being received as of Catholick Faith.* What ſeemingly more Orthodox, and ſpoken more like a Proteſtant? But our Author for fear of Correction, tempers it immediately with ſome of their own Ingredients, here and there cautiouſly applied. *Vindication.*

applied. As for example; if we ask, Whether the Scripture be their *whole Rule of Faith*? He answers, Scripture *rightly understood*, is a Rule of Faith; the Gospel revealed by Christ, and *preserved* by the Catholick Church, is their whole Rule of Faith. Is it asked again, Whether there are *no new Revelations, no new Articles received as of Catholick Faith*? He answers, *These Truths are only received which the Church proposes as delivered to her by the Apostles.* The meaning of which Phrases, *the Gospel rightly understood*, and *preserved by the Church*, and *the Truths which the Church proposes as delivered*, is, that which is thus *preserved, proposed, delivered*, and *interpreted* by the Church, is as much the Rule as the Scripture, and that without this Tradition and Exposition of the Church, the Scripture is in *Bellarmine*'s Phrase, but a *partial Rule.*

De verbo non Scripto l. 4. c. 12. SS. *dico secundo Script.*

Clear Proof.

Scripture thus interpreted is a Catholick Rule of Faith; the *Addresser* therefore meant nothing less than to diminish its Divine Authority; his design was to preserve it, and that each mans private sense might not sacrilegiously pretend to be that *Word of God*, which, as St. *Peter* minds us, *is not of private Interpretation*; 'Tis not against the Authority or Use of Scripture he writ, but against the Protestants unjust and insignificant method of using it. I will here make good the Charge, (hoping, that when he thinks fit, he will much more fully perform it) by the very answers given to his Questions, which I shall set down in that Order and Sense in which the Answerer construed them.

Vindication.

Here he tells us, *'Tis not against the Authority or use of Scripture the Addresser writ*, The Divine Authority of Scripture consists in its being of Divine Revelation, and the reason for which it was revealed, is for the use, instruction, and salvation of mankind. But if it be insufficient for attaining that end, and either is wanting in what is neeessary, or is writ in a way so obscure and dubious that it's not to be understood by those for whom it was written, it's certainly a Revelation unworthy of God, and a considerable argument against its Divine Authority. And therefore he that undertakes to prove this, must, if he be in earnest, have a very mean opinion of that Divine Book, and designs to bring others to the like opinion of it. But this is the apparent design of the *Addresser*, who argues all along against the sufficiency and perspicuity of Scripture, even in those points which our Author owns to be *the two principal Articles of Christian Belief*, the Trinity and the Incarnation of Christ; clearly giving away the Cause to the *Arians* and *Nestorians*, and frankly acknowledging, nay

venturing in his way to prove, that the Texts usually insisted on by the Orthodox in proof of those Articles, are not sufficient for it. So that in conclusion, if the Scripture be so perplex'd and obscure, so doubtful and ambiguous, so unintelligible and insufficient a Rule, they may as well lay aside the Scripture, as that Father did the obscure Poet, with an, *If thou art not to be understood, thou art not fit to be read.* And yet after all this charge insinuated all along in the *Address* against the Scripture, *'Tis not yet against the Authority or Use of it he writ.* What then did he write against? It was *against the Protestants unjust and insignificant method of using it; and that each mans private sense might not sacrilegiously pretend to be that word of God, which, as St.* Peter *minds us, is not of private Interpretation.* I must confess if *each* or any mans private sense be pretended to be the Word of God, it's both *Unjust* and *Sacrilegious*, since nothing can be the Word of God, but what is by his immediate Inspiration. But where are they that thus pretend? What reason is there for this charge? These are things he takes for granted, but insinuates that this is done by the Protestants, who interpret Scripture by their own *private sense*. But why will this any more prove that because they interpret Scripture by their own sense, they pretend their sense to be the Word of God; than it follows that those that resolve all into a *deciding Church-Authority*, do therefore pretend that the sense given by that Authority is the Word of God? For I presume after all, that they will not dare to say such their Interpretations are as much the Word of God, as the Word is, which they are the Interpretations of. However, he intimates, it's *Sacrilegious* to interpret Scripture by each mans private sense, when St. *Peter* minds us the *Word of God is not of private Interpretation.* But surely the Apostle doth not therein include the using and understanding of Scripture by private persons, as if that was forbidden, when he tells them they did *well to give heed to it*, ver. 19. Neither did he suppose they were uncapable of understanding it, when he calls it a *light*, and unto which they were to *give heed till the day dawn, &c.* Nor farther will the Apostles Argument admit of any such Exposition, which is thus, *Ye ought to give heed to the Scripture, for it's not of private Interpretation; for holy men of God spake as they were moved*; that is, Scripture is the Interpretation of God's will, the Inspiration of the Holy Ghost; and though wrote by men, is not of humane invention, nor was *their writings*, of their

own

own motion, nor an explication of their own mind, but of God's. Of this see a late Book called, *Texts of Scripture cited by Papists*, &c. Pag. 35.

The Prover now falls on in earnest, and with great resolution saith, he will *make good the charge* of the Protestants unjust and insignificant Interpretation of Scripture, *by the very Answers given to the Addresser's Questions*, and that he *will set them down in that order and sense in which the Answerer construed them.* I wish he had added too, *in his own words* (as the *Answerer* did by him.) For I find no great reason to trust him either as to *order* or *sense*.

Clear Proof. Qu. 1. *Whether all things necessary to Salvation are contained in Scripture?*

Ans. *Scripture must contain these Necessaries.*

De Doctr. Ch. l.2. c.9. All Catholics ever owned what St. *Augustin* teaches, That *all things which concern Faith and Manners of Life are found in those things which are plainly contained in Scripture*; So that, as St. *Gregory* expresses it, *God needs speak to us no more* by any new Revelation. For, as the same St. *Augustin* observes in the Question betwixt Him and the *Donatists*, about true Baptism, which he held *absolutely* necessary to Salvation, *Tho we have no proof in this case from holy Scripture, yet we follow the truth of holy Scripture even in this case, when we do what the Universal present Church approves of, which Church is commended by the Authority of the very Scripture.*

Vindication. All true Catholics without doubt ever owned what St. *Austin* teaches, and that not so much because St. *Austin* teaches it, as that what he herein taught, is true. But (to use our Authors words, *pag.* 7.). *I wonder how this man was so confident as to name* St. *Austin*, and quote this place, after *the Answerer*, and then to declare *all Catholicks ever owned what he teaches.* Since I have good reason to question, whether our Author be of that number. And that,

1. Because all true Catholicks ever held the Doctrines of the Trinity, and the Incarnation of our Blessed Saviour, to be *things which concern Faith*, and as such, to be *plainly contained in Scripture.* But our Author on the contrary, saith these are not plainly contained in Scripture; and then either according to St. *Austin*, they should not concern Faith, or our Author is none of those *Catholicks* that *own what St.* Austin *teaches.*

2. The Church of *Rome* (which whatever others think, I question not but the *Prover* holds to be Catholick) owns not what St. *Austin* teaches; for she affirms there is a Word Unwritten as well as Written, and that this Unwritten Word is as ne-

cessary as the Written: Forasmuch as there are things *relating to Faith and Manners* in the Unwritten Word that are not contained in the Written. But here our Author has prevented me, for he will prove this also to be the sense of St. *Austin*, and both consistent; as thus, *All Catholicks own what St.* Augustin *teaches, that all things which concern Faith and Manners are plainly contained in Scripture.*——*For as the same St.* Augustin *observes about true Baptism, which he held absolutely necessary to Salvation, that we have no proof in this case from Scripture; Yet, &c.* That is, the Scripture contains all things necessary relating to Faith and Manners; for we have no proof from Scripture for a point absolutely necessary to Salvation: which is, as if he should say, *England* is a Country that abounds in all things necessary to Life; for it wants Bread which is absolutely necessary to it. This is in our Author's phrase, Pag. 5. *a special piece of Logic.* I will for the honour of St. *Austin*, and in charity to our Author, suppose he turned not to the place in that Father, when besides this impertinence he charges upon that Learned Writer, he reads, *we have no proof*, for *we have no example*; and speaks so darkly of the case it self. I will direct him to it, it's *Contr. Cresc. l.* 1. *c.* 32. let him read it at his leisure, and compare it with *Ch.* 33. And in the mean time I shall furnish him with another saying of the same Father, *Whether concerning Christ, or his Church, or any other thing which belongs to Faith and Life, I will not say, If we, who are not to be compared with him that said, Though We; but if an Angel from heaven shall teach besides what ye have received in the Prophetical or Evangelical Writings, let him be accursed.* Contr. Liter. Petiliani. l. 3. c. 6.

But the case in this first Question, as it appears stated by the Addresser, is, Whether all things necessary to Salvation are *immediately* and *expresly* contain'd in Scripture, or drawn thence by an *evident* Consequence? Our Answerer proves they are so, by the three following Texts; his Proofs I will set in a due form, that their force may lie open to all. Clear Proof.

The first Text is taken out of *Joh.* 20. 31. where the *Evangelist* having premised, (v. 30.) *Many other signs also did Jesus in the sight of his Disciples, which are not written in this Book*; says, v. 31. *These* (which he had set down) *are written that you may believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and that believing you may have Life in his Name.* Now what Conclusion can be drawn from this Text to our present purpose, but one, in one of these two forms? First thus: *The signs set down by St. John,* Ch. 20. *are sufficient to make us believe that Jesus is Christ the Son of God; but precisely to believe that Jesus is Christ the Son of God, is all that is necessary*

to have Life in his name, or to Salvation; therefore the 20th. Chapter of St. John *contains all things neceſſary to Salvation.* Or elſe thus, in the Anſwerer's words: *All that is as ſufficient in its kind to beget Faith in us, as Faith is to ſave us, contains all things neceſſary to Salvation; But the 20th Chapter of St.* John's *Goſpel, as it appears by* ver. 31. *is as ſufficient to beget Faith in us; therefore that 20th Chapter contains all things neceſſary to Salvation.* A ſpecial piece of Logic! However his Concluſion eaſes the Members of his Congregation from the Obligation of reading any part of Scripture beſides the 20*th* Chapter of St. *John*'s Goſpel.

Vindication. Our Author from his love to *Logic*, and his Skill in it, undertakes to *ſet the Anſwerer's Proofs in a due form.* But by his leave, I ſhall put in a ſmall Charge or two againſt it. As

The firſt Charge I have againſt what he calls a ſetting the Proofs *in a due form*, is, that his Concluſion is falſe in its form, as his Syllogiſm has four Terms in it: For ſaith he, *The ſigns ſet down by St.* John 20. *are ſufficient to make us believe Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God; but Preciſely, to believe that Jeſus is Chriſt the Son of God, is all that is neceſſary*, &c. For *preciſely* to believe that Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God, is to believe that and no more. Whereas, by that Phraſe, the Scripture implies the believing the whole Goſpel. So Joh. 11. 27. *I believe that thou art the Chriſt, the Son of God.* Acts 8. 37. *I believe that Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God.* 1 John 5. 5. *Who is he that overcometh the World, but he that believeth that Jeſus is the Son of God?*

2. He puts his Query too extravagantly. *Now what Concluſion can be drawn from this Text to our preſent purpoſe, but one——— therefore the 20th Chapter of St.* John *contains all things neceſſary.* This is a Concluſion of his own forming, and before he can infer it, muſt ask two or three things, which he may be ſure will never be granted him.

1. He takes it for granted, that by *theſe* in St. *John*, are to be underſtood only the *Signs* ſet down in that Chapter.

Whereas (1.) St. *John* in the former Verſe, ſpeaking of the Signs done by Jeſus, ſaith they *are not written in this Book*, but *theſe are written.* Where? Not in that *Chapter*, (for to ſay the truth on't, whatever our Author thinks, St. *John* did not divide his Goſpel into Chapters) but in that *Book.* And thus inded *Bellarmin* underſtands it.

De Verbo l. 4. c. 10. *ſſ. Reſpondeo ad primum.*

But

But (2.) The Apoſtle further enlarges this Phraſe, Chap. 21. 24, 25. *This is the Diſciple which teſtifieth of theſe things, and wrote theſe things —— And there are alſo many other things which Jeſus did.* And ſo what is true of the *Signs*, is alſo true of the other things wrote by that Evangeliſt.

(3.) Tho St. *John* ſpoke this more eſpecially of the things writ by himſelf, yet the ſame is applicable to what was wrote by the reſt of the Divine Writers: And it might be ſaid of what was written by them, as well as of what was written by him, *Theſe are written that ye might believe.* And this was the uſe made of this place of St. *John* in the *Anſwer*, *viz.* to ſhew what was the end the Scripture was written for, and the ſufficiency of Scripture in order to that end; and this that Quotation proves; for if any part, and much more the whole of Scripture *was written that they might believe*; Surely then they might believe by reading what was written. Thus it was argued in the Anſwer, p. 3. *The Scripture muſt fail of its end, and we of the Salvation therein revealed, if that be not as ſufficient in its kind to beget Faith in us, as Faith is to ſave us.* For ſaith St. *John*, *Theſe things are written*, &c. So that inſtead of our Author's Concluſion, I ſhall give him two other, which contain the force of what was there ſaid; they are theſe. The end for which the things are written in Scripture, is that we might believe; but the things written would fail of the end for which they were written, if they are not ſufficient to beget that Faith in us, which they were intended to be the means of. Again, If by the belief of what is contained in Scripture, we come to be ſaved (as St. *John* ſaith) then the Scripture muſt contain all thoſe things which are neceſſary to be believed. But ſaith the *Prover*, St. *John* ſaith all this of the *Signs* written in that Chapter: But that I have already prevented; or, if I ſhould ſay ſo, it's as tolerable, as it is for *Bellarmin* to affirm, that all the uſeful ends for which Scripture was wrote, are to be found in the 2*d* Epiſtle of St. *John*, the ſhorteſt Book of Scripture. But however, here is a dreadful Charge at the heels of it. For, ſaith the *Prover*, *The Concluſion eaſes the Members of his Congregation from the Obligation of reading any part of Scripture, beſides the 20th Chapter of St.* John's *Goſpel.* We may gueſs to what Church our Author belongs, when he will have it an *eaſe* to the People, to be diſcharged from reading the Scripture.

De Verbo, l. 4. c. 10. *Neque.*

ture. Tho at the ſame time, I wonder how he came to ſtumble upon the word *Obligation*: For how is this to be reconciled to the Practice of that Church, which *eaſes* the People of the whole, and permits them not to read the 20*th* Chapter of St. *John*, nor any other part of Scripture, tho they are under a Divine *Obligation* ſo to do?

But in the Name of *Logic* and the Univerſity our Author was of, how comes this Concluſion on, That if all things neceſſary to Salvation are contained in the 20*th* Chapter of St. *John*, That *therefore the People are eaſed from the Obligation of reading more?*

Ut ſupra. I remember *Bellarmin* at this place argues much at this rate, If *St.* John's *Goſpel contains all things neceſſary, then the reſt of Scripture is Superfluous.* But the ſame *Bellarmin*, when preſs'd another

C. 12. *ff. Reſpondeo ad.* way, aſſerts, *There are many things in Scripture, which of themſelves do not pertain to Faith, that is, which are not therefore written, becauſe they are neceſſary to be believed.* And again, *There may be*

C. 11. *ff. Septimo.* *things ſufficient for Baptiſm, but which ſuffice not abſolutely for the Church.* So that it ſeems there are things neceſſary and ſufficient in one reſpect, and not in another; ſome neceſſary for Salvation abſolutely, ſome for Edification. And therefore it follows not, that becauſe all things abſolutely neceſſary, are contained in ſome part of Scripture, therefore the others are *Superfluous*, and *there is no Obligation to read them.* For then it would alſo follow, that becauſe all things neceſſary are contained in the *New Teſtament*, therefore the Church in our Author's Phraſe, *is eaſed from the Obligation of reading the old.* And becauſe three thouſand were converted by one Sermon, *Acts* 2. therefore all beſides what was contained in that Sermon, would have been *Superfluous.*

Clear Proof. The ſecond Text of Scripture is, 2 *Tim.* 3. 15, 16 where the Apoſtle having thus warned *Timothy* immediately before, v. 14. *Continue in thoſe things which thou haſt learnt, and are committed to thee, knowing of whom thou haſt learnt*; by which words he renews the commands he had given him, *O* Timothy! *keep the depoſitum; have a form of ſound words,*

1 Tim. 6. 20. *which thou haſt heard of me, in Faith*; The ſaid Apoſtle minds him that

2 Tim. 1. 13. in his Infancy he had read the Old Teſtament, which bears ſufficiently witneſs that Chriſt was the Meſſias, v. 15, 16. *Becauſe from thine infancy thou haſt known the holy Scriptures, which can inſtruct thee* (the Proteſtant Verſion hath, *make thee wiſe*) *to Salvation by the Faith that is in Chriſt Jeſus. All Scripture inſpired of God is* profitable *to teach, to argue, to correct, to inſtruct in Juſtice, that the man of God may be perfect, inſtructed,*

ſtructed to every good work. Hence the Miniſter argues thus; *The ſame Apoſtle that ſays all Scripture, (i.e. each part of Scripture) is given by Inſpiration of God, ſays that the Scriptures are able to make us wiſe to Salvation; But men cannot be wiſe to Salvation, without knowing what is neceſſary to ſalvation.* Here he leaves us, but I will make up the Syllogiſm *Therefore the Old Teſtament alone, nay every part of Scripture, contains all things neceſſary to ſalvation.* Thus you ſee the Miniſter reſts ſatisfied with the firſt Chapter of *Geneſis* for his *whole Rule of Faith.* The truth is, that St. *Paul* only teaches there, that the Teſtament, or any part of Scripture, is of good uſe, is *profitable* to inſtruct any one in the concerns of his Salvation. What's this to the containing of all neceſſaries to Salvation? Bread is of very good uſe to preſerve Life, and enables a man to perform all the duties of it; is therefore nothing elſe neceſſary? What pitiful ſhifts are theſe?

Vindication.

Here I muſt take leave to charge our Author with notorious Sophiſtry, not only from the falſe Conſtruction of his Syllogiſm (whether out of Ignorance or Deſign I know not) but alſo for the falſeneſs of the matter contained in it. The *Anſwerer* indeed undertook to prove the Scripture contains all things neceſſary to Salvation; and that *we are as ſure of its ſufficiency in that kind, as we are of its Divine Authority: foraſmuch as the ſame Apoſtle that ſaid all Scripture is of Divine Inſpiration, doth alſo immediately before as poſitively affirm that the Scriptures are able to make us wiſe unto Salvation*, 2 Tim. 3. 15, 16. This is the whole of what the *Anſwerer* ſaid upon this place; and now with what Conſcience could onr Author charge this following Conſeqnence upon him? *Hence the Miniſter argues thus, The ſame Apoſtle that ſays all Scripture (i. e. each part of Scripture) is given by Inſpiration of God, ſays that the Scriptures are able to make us wiſe to Salvation; but men cannot be wiſe to Salvation, without knowing what is neceſſary to Salvation.* Is this He that ſaid he would *ſet down the Anſwerers Proofs in due Form?* Then God deliver us from ſuch Undertakers. In ſhort, it's very evident that the Argument in the *Anſwer*, reduced into *due Form*, is this; *If the ſame Apoſtle ſaith the Scriptures are able to make us wiſe unto Salvation, that ſaith they are of Divine Inſpiration, then we are as certain of their Sufficiency as we are of their Authority; but the ſame Apoſtle ſaith the Scriptures are able to make us wiſe to Salvation, that ſaith they are of Divine Inſpiration: Therefore we are as certain of their Sufficiency as we are of their Authority.* This is the Argument, and this I will abide by; and if our Author had been a fair Diſputant, he would have ſhewed how either the Premiſes were falſe, or the Concluſion not juſtly inferred from them; and

ſince the place in which his Cauſe was moſt concerned, is *ver.* 15. that *the Scriptures are able to make us wiſe unto Salvation*; he ſhould have directed his Anſwer to it; but he found it too hard for him, and ſo ſhuffles it off to the next verſe, *All Scripture is given by inſpiration of God, and is profitable*, &c. Whereas ſuppoſing that *all Scripture* there, was after his wild way (which I am not at preſent concerned to refute) to be applied *to each part of Scripture*; yet what is that to *ver.* 15. where it's ſaid τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα, *the holy Scriptures*, the ſame which *Timothy* had *known from a child*, are *able to make wiſe unto Salvation*? But though for fear of being engaged further, he durſt not undertake it; yet he inſinuates in an inference of his own, that it was the old Teſtament only that *Timothy* had read.

But 1. How doth it appear that he read not alſo the Books of the New that were then extant, of which there were many? For *Bellarmin* in his Anſwer to this, only ſays, *When this Epiſtle was writ, the Apocalypſe was not then extant, nor the Goſpel of* John, *and perhaps ſome other Book was wanting, of the Body of the Scripture.* Thereby yielding, the reſt were then Written and Publiſhed.

Cap. 10. 8. Quod autem.

2. If the Old Teſtament was able to make them that then read it *wiſe unto Salvation*; then ſurely both Old and New is as ſufficient now, as the Old alone was then. Our Author may remember where this was urged upon him, but he prudently paſs'd over that Paragraph in ſilence.

I ſhall ſtill therefore conclude, that the Scripture is not only profitable, but neceſſary; and not only neceſſary, but ſufficient to anſwer that end for which it was revealed and written; and that is, that *we might believe*, and *be wiſe unto Salvation.*

Clear Proof.

His third Proof is this, Chriſt ſent the young man who put that Queſtion to him, *Maſter, what ſhall I do to inherit eternal Life*? to the Commandments, *thou knoweſt the Commandments*; and again declared that *Moſes* and the *Prophets* were ſufficient to diſpoſe a ſinner to repent. Behold another Logical Inference of great credit to the Univerſity this Anſwerer was brought up in! *By reading* Moſes *and the Prophets I am moved to repent from my ſins; and if I will know what I muſt do to inherit eternal Life, I muſt know the Commandments; therefore all things neceſſary to ſalvation are contained in Scripture.* I may with Juſtice return to this man more than what he ungroundedly ſays to the Addreſſer, p. 1. *that he takes up with ſuch a ſort of Arguments, which, tho not uſeful to make any of his Religion, may very well make others of none.* If ſuch uſe only could be made of Scripture, it would be of no uſe at all to our Salvation;

Luc. 10. 25.
Luc. 16. 29.

no

no ſenſeleſs Hereſie hath appeared this 1600 years, which was not backt by more ſeeming Proofs from Scripture than theſe.

Here our Author again prevaricates. The words in the *Anſwer* are theſe, *From which Conſideration* (that all things neceſſary are in Scripture) *it was, that all doubts relating to Salvation were hereby to be reſolved, which could not be, were not all things neceſſary to Salvation contained in it.* In which there are theſe Two plain Propoſitions, 1. That all doubts relating to Salvation might and were to be reſolved by Scripture. 2. That they could not be reſolved by Scripture, unleſs all things neceſſary to Salvation were contained in it. The firſt of theſe, which is the chief thing to be proved, the *Anſwerer* ſhewed from *Luke* 10. 25, 26. and *Mark* 10. 17, 19. *Luke* 16. 29. In the firſt of theſe places, our Saviour upon the Queſtion put to him *Maſter, What ſhall I do to inherit eternal life?* Replies, *What is written in the Law? how readeſt thou?* And he anſwering, ſaid, *Thou ſhalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart*, &c. To which our Saviour replies, v. 28. *Thou haſt anſwered right, this do, and thou ſhalt live.* *Vindication.*

What ſaith the *Prover* to this? His Anſwer from *Bays*, p. 7. might well be returned, were it ſeemly in ſo ſerious an Argument as we are upon. He is indeed ſilent, and (in his words elſewhere) *one may gueſs at the reaſon without caſting a Figure.* The ſame Queſtion is again put to our Saviour, *Mark* 10. 17. and our Saviour anſwers, *v.* 19. *Thou knoweſt the commandments*, &c. implying, That in the Law, of which the Decalogue was a part, there was the way preſcribed, by which Eternal Life was to be obtained.

The Third place in the Anſwer is, *Luke* 16. 29. where the Rich man in Hell intreating that *Lazarus* might be ſent to his Five brethren, *leſt they come into that place of torment*; he was anſwered, *They have Moſes and the Prophets, let them hear them.* And when he ſuppoſed that was not ſufficient, but *if one went from the dead, they would repent*; *Abraham* anſwers again, *If they hear not Moſes and the Prophets, neither will they be perſwaded*, &c. In which there are theſe things: Firſt it's ſuppoſed, That if they did repent, they would not come into that place of Torment. 2. That if they hearkned to *Moſes* and the Prophers, they would repent. 3. That whatever was neceſſary to their Repentance, they might find, and was contained in *Moſes* and the Prophets. What ſaith

the *Prover* to this? Why, instead of an Answer, he will be at his *Logic*, and putting *the Answerer's Proof in a due Form*; which he ushers in with great Triumph, *Behold another Logical Inference, of great Credit to the Vniversity this Answerer was brought up in!* Well, what is this *Logical Inference*? It's this, *By reading Moses and the Prophets, I am moved to repent of my sins; and if I will know what I must do to inherit Eternal Life, I must know the Commandments; therefore all things necessary to Salvation, are contained in Scripture.* If our *Prover's* Sincerity be no better than his Logic, he is no more a Credit to his Religion, than he is to his University, if ever he was of one. Here's a defect in both, but which prevails is not easie to determine. I can relieve him by no other way, but by supposing the Argument in the Answer gave him a Shock, and his Brain was out of order before his Inference. But without exposing his weakness further, I will set him right, and leave him to his Cell for the rest. The *Answerer's* Argument is this, when set in *due form*, *If all questions and doubts relating to Salvation are to be resolved by Scripture, then all things necessary to Salvation are contained in Scripture; but all questions and doubts relating to Salvation are to be resolved by Scripture (as appears from the Texts quoted above) therefore, &c.* I shall here return him my words again, because in repeating he has perverted them, *He takes up with such a sort of Arguments, which how useful soever they may prove* [I will recall it, and say with him *tho not useful*] *to make some men of their Religion, have a plainer tendency to* (not as he corrupts them, *may very well*) *make others of none.*

Clear proof.

Q. 2. *Whether all things necessary to Salvation are clearly contained in Scripture?*

Ans. From Scripture, *not a word.*

However he condescends to deliver His sense, and that of his Church, on this Question; It is, That all persons cannot *immediately* learn all the necessaries to Salvation by *meer reading* of Scripture; that many other helps are *necessary*, to wit, *attention, consideration*, to be cleared from *prejudices* and *prepossessions*, from *pride, love of the world, interest, obstinacy, partiality, sloth*; and besides all this, the assistance of *teaching Guides*, and a *dependency* from God for the Wisdom he hath promised, (such promises I find made to the Church, but not any to particulars that shall refuse to be absolutely guided by the Church;) *So that Scripture is plain in this sense only, that by these means it may be apprehended.* Now by *Guides* he means not false ones, such as Christ bid us beware of, and consequently till a Protestant hath a reasonable conviction that his Church-Teachers, tho' divided from the Catholic Church, and condemned by General Councils, tho' Abettors of a Religion of not 150 years settlement, tho not in Communion

Mat. 7. 15.

on with *one* Biſhop in the whole World out of His Majeſty's Dominions, yet ſtill are *true Guides*; and till he be morally ſure that he wants not himſelf any one of the ten other diſpoſitions requir'd, is to perſuade himſelf that he may very well be one of thoſe who *wreſt* the Scripture *to their perdition*, and conſequently hath no good ground for any one Act of Faith. This will create but ſmall comfort to any Proteſtant. Leſs yet will he find in St. *Cyril*'s Sentence, *The things that are eaſie, are yet to Heretics hard to underſtand*; eſpecially if all thoſe be Heretics, according to St. *Auguſtin*, *who when the Doctrine of Catholic Faith is declared to them, chuſe to oppoſe it, and rather embrace what is their own ſenſe*; if the Catholic Faith be, according to the ſame Dr, *a Communion with the whole world*, ſo that, according as his Scholar St. *Proſper* defines it, *a Chriſtian when in Communion with this General Church, is a Catholic*; *when ſeparated from her, an Heretick*, I wonder how this man was ſo confident as to name that word *Heretic*; which his Brethren are uſually as much afraid to mention, as a murtherer to come up to the murder'd Corps, leſt by its bleeding he be betray'd.

In Jo. l. 1. c. 4.
L. 4. de Bapt. cont. Don c. 16.
L 2 con. Gaud.
In Dim. H.

He ſaith that as to this ſecond Queſtion, there is *from Scripture not a word* in the *Anſwer*. And what needed it, when the ſame Texts that were brought to prove the Scripture contains all things neceſſary, do prove that it *plainly* contains them? As for inſtance, *Joh.* 20. 31. *Theſe are written that ye might believe, and that believing ye might have life*. Where the end for which they were written, which was *that they might believe*; and the perſons for whom they were written, for all Chriſtians; ſufficiently prove, that they were for the manner ſo expreſt, as well as from the matter ſo evident, that they might believe. *Vindication.*

So again, 2 *Tim.* 3. 15. *The Scriptures are able to make thee wiſe unto Salvation*. If they were the Scriptures that *Timothy knew from a child*, and were able to make him *wiſe unto Salvation*, ſurely they were plain in thoſe things.

So again, *Luk.* 10 25. *What is written in the Law? How readeſt thou?* muſt needs imply the Law was plain to be read and underſtood. So *Luk.* 16. 29. *They have Moſes and the Prophets*. But to what purpoſe, if *Moſes* and the Prophets were not to be underſtood by them?

But, 2. What proof would he have of this? Can he have any plainer proof, than from the things contained therein? *Tolle lege*, will ſhew there is a God, and God alone is to be worſhipped. That the Soul is immortal. That there is a future ſtate, and that a ſtate of rewards and puniſhments. That man is fallen. That Chriſt redeemed him. That Chriſt is the Son of God. That he

became man. That he was Crucified, and died a Sacrifice for us. That he roſe from the dead, aſcended into Heaven, is there our Mediator, &c. of which and the like, we may ſay as *Juſtin Martyr* did to *Trypho* the *Jew*, *Attend to what I ſhall rehearſe out of the holy Scriptures, proofs which need not to be explained, but only to be heard.*

But he goes on, *However the Anſwerer delivers his ſenſe on this Queſtion: It is, That all perſons cannot immediately learn all neceſſaries by meer reading of Scripture; that many other helps are neceſſary, to wit, attention, conſideration.* And can he ſay any thing to the contrary? Some things are ſo plain, as that *with the meer reading of them*, they are immediately underſtood; Others require attention and conſideration, and yet be plain, though not equally as plain as the former. The *Anſwerer* further proceeded to ſhew the mind ought to *be clear'd from prejudices*. And doth this detract any thing from the perſpicuity of Scriptures? For the Propoſitions may be plain, but yet be obſcure to him that is under prepoſſeſſions, as was ſhewed at large in the *Anſwer*. All which were there ſum'd up thus, *If men come with an honeſt heart, and uſe a competent diligence, with a dependence upon God's aſſiſtance for the wiſdom he hath promiſed, I know nothing neceſſary to Salvation but what is plainly taught in Scripture, and may be learn'd from it.* What hath the *Prover* to ſay to this? *Such promiſes* [of obtaining wiſdom from God] *I find made to the Church, but not to any particular that ſhall refuſe to be abſolutely guided by the Church.* But is not this promiſe made to *particulars* without any mention of the Church, that he is to learn it from? What thinks he of the place *the Anſwerer* had his eye upon? *Jam.* 1. 5. *If any of you lack wiſdom, let him ask of God, and it ſhall be given him.* What of *Joh.* 7. 17. *If any man will do his will, he ſhall know of the Doctrine, whether it be of God?* Now it ſhould have been, according to our Author's projection, If any man lack wiſdom, or would know whether the Doctrine be of God, let him go to the infallible Church, to the Vicar of Chriſt, or a Council called by him, or to the Guides of that Church. *For unleſs the Scripture be explain'd by ſome one that cannot err, it cannot be underſtood*; and ye will dangerouſly err by reading it, as *Bellarmin* argues. And yet whether there be ſuch a Church, or whether the Church pretending to it, be not a fallible, and what is worſe, a deceiving Church; or whether the *Guides* be not *falſe ones*; a man cannot be ſo much as *morally ſure*, without

De Verbo l. 4. c. 4. ſſ. ſeptimo.

he

he consult and understand the Scripture; and when all is done (according to this Author's way of arguing) *he may very well be one of those who wrest the Scripture to his own perdition, and consequently hath no good ground for any one act of Faith*; or can be certain that there is a Church, or this or that is the true Church, *&c.* This Paragraph of his is a kind of *Jargon*. But it affords occasion to put it to him, Who are the *false* Teachers, those that with the Pharisees set up Tradition to an equal Authority with Scripture; or those that maintain Scripture alone to be of Divine Authority? Those that make Scripture to depend upon the Church; or those that make the Church to depend upon Scripture? Those that teach we are *absolutely* to submit to the Church and the Guides of it; or those that with the Apostle direct us to follow them only as they follow Christ, 1 *Cor.* 11. 1? Those that say men err by reading the Scriptures, and so take away from them that Key of Knowledg; or those that with our Saviour teach them they err for not knowing them, *Mat.* 22. 29? Those that discourage men from reading the Scriptures, because of their pretended obscurity; or those that with our Saviour require that they search them, and that because they are (as the *Psalmist* saith) a light to their paths? Those that, with the Fathers, hold the Doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation, may be clearly proved from Scripture; or those that make them to depend upon Church Authority? Those that derive theirs down for a thousand years after Christ, without any proof from Scripture and precedent Antiquity; or those that Reformed their Church 1500 years after Christ, but can deduce the Genealogy of their Doctrines from Scripture and Genuine Antiquity for 4, 5, and 600 years after?

I ask him again, Who are the *Heretick* (in the sense he gives us) those that with the *Donatists* in St. *Austin*'s time confine the Church to their own party; or those that with the Apostle, comprehend in it *all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord both theirs and ours*, 1 Cor. 1. 2? Those that exclude the whole world if not of their corrupt Communion; or those that, according to his Quotation from St. *Austin*, maintain *a communion with the whole world*? Methinks, after all he might, to return his own words, *be as much afraid to mention that word Heretic, as a Murtherer to come up to the murther'd Corps*, considering what havoc and devastation they have made amongst those

they have call'd by that name. I ſhall give him Quotation for Quotation from St. *Auſtin*, and ſo conclude this Queſtion: *It ſuffices us, that we hold that Church which is demonſtrated by moſt manifeſt Teſtimonies of the holy and Canonical Scripture.* And again, *Shew that there is ſome clear and manifeſt teſtimony given from Holy Canonical Scriptures to this thy Communion, and I do confeſs we are to go over to thee.*

De Unit. Eccleſ. c. 18.

C 19.

Clear Proof.

Q. 3. *What are the neceſſaries to Salvation?*

Here plain and full Scripture will be of great uſe; we may expect ſhoals of Texts: What anſwer from Scripture is given to this Queſtion, think you? E'en the ſame as honeſt *Bays* returns to a hard one in the *Rehearſal*, *I Gad I won't tell you.* No, he gives not one word of anſwer to it, tho it be ſo material. Any one may gueſs at the reaſon, without caſting a figure.

Vindication.

With what Confidence can the *Prover* thus impoſe upon the Reader? Was there *not one word of Anſwer* returned to this Queſtion? Of that let the *Anſwer* ſpeak; Where it's thus put, Q. 3. *What are theſe Neceſſaries to Salvation?* The *Anſwer* begins thus. *Our Author offers three Inſtances of ſuch Neceſſaries as are not clearly revealed in Scripture*, viz. *the Trinity, the Incarnation of our Saviour, and the Obſervation of the Lords Day.* And of theſe, the *Anſwerer* Diſcourſes for near eight Pages together, to ſhew that the *Addreſſer* had to little purpoſe objected againſt them. So that if the Trinity, and Incarnation, and the Lord's day, are neceſſaries, and for that reaſon were ſingled out as Inſtances of the Scriptures inſufficiency and obſcurity by the *Addreſſer*, and on the contrary were defended by the *Anſwerer*; then ſurely, the 3*d* Queſtion no more wants an Anſwer, than the *Prover* wants Confidence that denies it. He writes indeed, as if the Queſtion was barely propoſed in the *Anſwer*, and he has uſed ſome art to confirm it, when he has made as many Queſtions as there are Inſtances, *viz.* of the Trinity, Incarnation, and the Lord's day: So that Queſtion the 4*th*, in the *Anſwer*, is Queſtion the 7*th* in the *Proof*. And this he does, that the Reader, if he has not the *Anſwer* before him, may not be aware of his Falſification, nor ſuſpect that a man that firſt of all writes for the Publick, and then engaged to *ſet down the Queſtions in the order of the* Anſwerer, could be ſo falſe to both, as to affirm, *there is not one word of Anſwer.*

Q. 4.

Q. 4 'Tis in its whole extent this; *By what Text of Scripture are we plainly taught that God is One in Substance, Three in Person? For as* Joh. 10 50. *Christ says*, I and my Father are One; *so* 17. 21. *he prays*, That all Believers may be One, as he and his Father are one; *This second place may seem to expound the first, and then Christ and his Father will be One only morally, as all the Believers be One. Or else, what Texts declares the Three Persons to be One by identity of substance?* Clear Proof.

Ans. Not one Text of Scripture to give us the dubious Sense of the two in Question! And yet these men pretend to clear Scripture for each Fundamental Point! The Answerer supplies this want of Scripture with two Reasons. The first is this; *Of the Three that bear record in Heaven, 'tis said they* are *One*; *but of the Three that bear witness on Earth, they* agree *in one.* (I will admit this English Translation, tho Apocryphal.) But what then? *But if in both were meant only a moral Union, it would have been as well said of the Three that bear record in Heaven, they* agree *in One*; *therefore they have more than a moral Union.* Is not this special Logic? Would not this way of arguing prove equally that the *Believers* are one with more than a moral Union, because otherwise it might as well have been said, *Joh.* 17. *May they agree in one.* The Question is, Whether this second clear Text concerning the Three that bear Witness on Earth, and which we know to be only *morally One*, doth not expound what that Unity is, that is found in the Three which bear record in Heaven? We ask a proof out of Scripture to decide this doubt; but our Answerer hath none to give us, or is grown Churlish, and will not allow us any. Hath he any to expound the other Text? No, not any; but he offers at some Insinuation from Scripture, and 'tis this: *When Christ said*, I and my Father are One, *the* Jews *took up stones to stone him for blasphemy, because that thou being a Man (said they) makest thy self God: The* Jews *then understood him to have spoken of a Natural Union, therefore he did so.* Well, I will let my good nature work upon me once, and for quiets sake I will let this Discourse pass as allowable; But in return of Curtesy I hope each sober Protestant will own this following Argument to be of at least as good Alloy; *When Christ said*, Joh. 6. Unless you eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, you have no Life in you; *The* Jews, *who said, how can this man give us his Flesh to eat? and his Disciples, who walked no more with him, understood that he spake of his natural Body which they should corporally eat; therefore Christ did really mean they should corporally feed on his natural Flesh.* This Popish Conclusion is in the same Form.

This is the first Instance of Scripture's obscurity in matters necessary, offered by the *Addresser:* And here the *Answerer* shewed in general, how frivolous and absurd the way of arguing used on this matter, by that Author, was; (to which we have not a word of Reply) and then particularly, that the two Scriptures, *viz.* 1 *John* 5. 7. and *John* 10. 30. usually insisted on amongst others in proof of the Doctrine of the Trinity, remain in their full Vindication.

full force, notwithſtanding what the *Addreſſer* had objected againſt them. But to this the *Prover* now Replies, *There is not one Text of Scripture to give us the dubious Senſe of the two in Queſtion.* What means he? Would he have Texts to prove the Father, the Word and Holy Ghoſt, to be three Divine Perſons? That was not the *Anſwerer*'s part to prove; or if it was, he might ſend him to his Friend *Bellarmin*, who in Proof of the Deity of our Saviour, has collected about 100 Texts of the Old and New Teſtament. Would he have ſome Chapter and Verſe, where are theſe or the like Words, *The word* One, *in the firſt Epiſtle of St.* John; *Item, in St.* John's *Goſpel, ſignifies a ſtrict Identity*; yes by all means, for ſaith the *Addreſſer*, *This ought to be, if all neceſſaries to Salvation are contained in Scripture.*

De Chriſto l. 1. c. 4, &c.

I thought our Author might by this time have been ſenſible of this weakneſs; certainly this Gentleman's Condition calls for ſome Commiſeration; and he would do well to adviſe upon it, whether the Scripture was originally divided into Chapter and Verſe; and whether *Hugo Cardinalis*, and *Robert Stephens*, were not very Ignorant, or unadviſed to Labour in this Work anew, if ſo it had been.

But is there no other way to give the Senſe of theſe Texts? Suppoſe we conſider the Words and Phraſes, the Context and Scope of the Places in queſtion, and compare them with others, and from all draw ſome good and ſubſtantial *Reaſons*; will not that be as proper, and as much to the purpoſe, as if we had Chapter and Verſe in his way? And this was the way taken by the *Anſwerer*. As for Example, in 1 *John* 5. 7.

1. It was there obſerved, that it's as plainly ſaid the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghoſt, are *One*, as that they are *Three.*

2. That the Union betwixt theſe Three, was not a mere moral Union, or a Union only of Will and Conſent; for the Apoſtle *makes a plain difference betwixt the Three that bear Record in Heaven*, and the Three that bear Witneſs in Earth: For of the Three in Heaven, it's ſaid, they are *One*; but of the Three in Earth, they *agree in one.* Of this the *Prover* ſaith, *I will admit this Engliſh Tranſlation* [agree in one] *tho Apocryphal.* Why an *Engliſh Tranſlation*? or why *Apocryphal?* Unleſs it be that it's nor Verbatim, according to what they call the *Authentick* Vulgar Tranſlation. For otherwiſe their own *Clarius* and *Bellarmin*, &c. do thus tranſlate it, *Conveniunt in unum, & conſpirant in unum.* But *admit this*,

this, ſaith he, *What then?* Then the *Anſwerer* thus proceeded in his Argument, *Now if it had been a mere moral Union that was betwixt the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghoſt (who are the Three in Heaven) it would have been as well ſaid of them as of the Spirit, the Water and the Blood (which are the Three in Earth) that they agree in one.* Here the *Prover* exults. *Is not this ſpecial Logic? Would not this way of arguing prove equally, that the Believers are one, with more than a moral Union; becauſe, otherwiſe it might as well have been ſaid* Joh. 17. *May they agree in one?*

As for the Logic, it is *Bellarmin*'s as well as the *Anſwerer*'s, who from the different Phraſes ἐν and εἰς ἕν, thus argues, *Whence you may plainly ſee, that the Spirit, Water, and Blood, are not One,* (as the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghoſt) *but only do agree in one Teſtimony.* And as for the Inference the *Prover* makes, *Would not this way of Arguing prove*, &c. I anſwer, the Caſe is not alike. For, De Chriſto l. 1. c. 4. ff. Quod autem.

1. The Force of the Argument doth not lie merely upon the difference of Phraſe (for both *Bellarmin* and the *Anſwerer* knew how *One* is ſometimes applied to a Moral Union, as *John* 17.) but upon its being uſed in this place by way of diſtinction betwixt things of a different nature; for proof of which it's to be obſerved, that the Apoſtle deſigning to ſhew the validity of the Teſtimony given to the Son of God, *v.* 5. which was twofold; he further amplifies this, and diſtinctly ſpeaks to each of them, *ver.* 7. and tho both do give Teſtimony to the ſame Truth, yet one in an higher, and the other in a lower degree. As,

(1.) There are Three that bear Record in Heaven, and Three in Earth.

(2.) The Three in Heaven are One, and the Three in Earth agree in One. By which way of arguing, and the diſtinction obſerved betwixt them, the Apoſtle ſhows, That the Three that bear Record in Heaven, are not more different in their Nature and Place from the Three in Earth, than in their Union: That they are both alike Three, and both alike in their Teſtimony, but that the one are in Heaven, the other in Earth: The Three in Heaven are One, but the Three in Earth *agree* in One: So that the Three in Earth are no more One, as the Three in Heaven, than the Three that bear Record in Earth, are the Three that bear Record in Heaven.

2. In

2. In confirmation of this, it's obſervable, that one of theſe Phraſes is more fit to expreſs a Natural than a Moral Union; that is, *they are One*, doth more aptly expreſs it, than *they agree in One*: And therefore whereas *they are One*, may ſometimes ſignifie a Moral Union, and may then be interpreted by, they *agree in One*; yet *agree in One* cannot be interpreted by, *they are One.*

3. From hence we have an anſwer to that Queſtion of his, *Whether this ſecond clear Text concerning the Three that bear witneſs on Earth, and which we know to be only Morally One, doth not expound what that Unity is that is found in the Three which bear Record in Heaven:*

I anſwer, No; for tho *One* ſometimes ſignifies a Moral Union, yet here, if ſo underſtood, it would quite deſtroy that diſtinction betwixt the one Three, and the other, and the Preference that the one Three had above the other Three in their Union.

4. By this we are prepared alſo to anſwer to his other Argument, when he ſaith, that when *our Saviour prays*, John 17. 21. *that all believers may be one, as he and his Father are one, may ſeem to expound*, John 10. 58. *I and my Father are one: and then Chriſt and his Father will be one only Morally, as all the Believers are one.* In anſwer to which;

1. It's granted that the Father and the Son may be ſaid to be one in a Moral Senſe, as one in conſent. But,

2. It doth not follow, that becauſe the Father and Son are thus One, that therefore they are no otherwiſe One; and that all Believers are as much One, as the Father and Son are One.

3. It's evident from what is ſpoke by way of Explication in that place, that it's otherwiſe; for when *ver.* 22. Chriſt prays, *that they may be one as we are one*, it's added *ver.* 23. Ἵνα ὦσι τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἕν, (the ſame Phraſe as 1 *John* 5. 8.) *that they may be made perfect in one*; implying that the Unity betwixt Believers, is of another nature than the Unity betwixt the Father and the Son.

4. The Union of Believers in *John* 17. cannot be applied to the Union betwixt the Father and the Son, in *John* 10. 50. becauſe this latter is a Union of Eſſence, as well as Will: And for confirmation of this, the *Anſwerer* offered an Argument from the Text it ſelf; to take off the force of which, the *Prover* in repeating it, leaves out a main branch of it; for thus he frames it

for

for the Answerer; *When Christ said, I and my Father are one, the Jews took up stones to stone him for blasphemy, because that thou being a man (said they) makest thy self God; The Jews then understood him to have spoken of a Natural Union, therefore he did so.* But the Inference in the *Answer* was this, *It follows that neither did our Saviour speak, nor the* Jews *understand him to have spoken of a Moral, but a Natural Union.* The first and the main Branch was, That our Saviour himself spoke of a Natural Union; the next was, That the *Jews* understood him also to have spoken of it: And for the first, I referred him to the Book, called, *The Doctrine of the Trinity and Transubstantiation compared*; but it wants an Answer, and so he cautiously takes no notice of it. But because he is herein so reserved, let me recommend him to his Friend *Bellarmin*, who concludes this Argument with, Constat eos rectè intellexisse, *It's evident, the* Jews *rightly understood our Saviour.* But it seems this Advice comes too late; for saith he, *I will let my good nature* (I wish he could say sincerity) *work upon me for once; and for quiets sake, I will let this discourse pass as allowable.* Whence is it that all o'th' sudden he is in so good a humour, and so forward in his allowances? The good man could not contain himself longer; for from a small advantage he espied (and which is somewhat rare with them now-a-days, and therefore not to be let slip) he will yield, tho the thing he yields be never so impertinent and absurd. *Let this pass*; What then? *In return of Courtesie*, saith he, *I hope each sober Protestant will own this following Argument to be at least of as good alloy: When Christ said,* John 6. *Unless you eat the Flesh, &c. the Jews, &c. understood that he spake of his Natural Body, therefore Christ did really mean they should corporally feed on his Natural Flesh.* But surely sober Protestants are for Reason, Pertinence, and Sincerity; but however, his Argument shall be *allowable*, if he can make it as evident the *Jews* did not mistake when they understood Christ spake of *his Natural Flesh, and a corporal feeding on it*: as it may be made appear, they did not mistake him, when they thought by his calling himself the Son of God, that he meant he was essentially of the same Nature, and one with God.

De Christo l. 1. c. 6. *ff. Secundo probo.*

Q. 5. *Is the mystery of the Incarnation of Christ clearly expresst in Scripture?* Or can it be clearly made out by Scripture, that those words, *John* 1. *The Word was made Flesh*, own'd by all Christians to be true, are to be understood in such sense, that Both Natures were in one Person, so that what is said of the Man Christ Jesus, be truly said of the Son of God; for example,

Clear Proof.

example, that the B. Virgin was *mother of God*; and not as the *Nestorians* understood them, to wit, that Christ was indeed a *true man, made of the Seed of David*; and that the Eternal Word, true God, was indeed in him, but not by a strict Personal Union?

Ans. Not one word from Scripture. What indeed all the *Nestorians* supposed, he proves; but as to the Unity of One Person uniting these two Natures, not *one word*. This man (any one may see) is of those who take the *Nestorians* to be a part of the Catholick Church; and no one will grudge their Congregation the Title of *such a part* of the Catholick Church, that is, a Member severed from the One Body of Christ.

Vindication. The *Prover* saith, *What all the* Nestorians *supposed he proves, but as to the Unity of one Person, &c. not one word.* Put case the *Answerer* had proved no more than what our Author now saith *Nestorius supposed*, if he proved what was sufficient to confute what the Addresser supposed for *Nestorius*; and then the *Answerer* could, as far as the Addresser then knew, be no *Nestorian*. Let us then see how the Addresser represented this Heresie. *Nestorius*, saith he, *and others denied that word* (is made Flesh) *to signifie a strict Incarnation.* But what then did he and others hold? *but either a Moral Union, or a meer External appearance of a man.* He tells us not whether both of these, or which of these was the opinion of *Nestorius*; but I shall not take this advantage, but suppose he meant the first, a *Moral Union*: And what is that? He tells us (*p.* 3. and as quoted in the *Answer*, *p.* 20.) *that is, he was a Man who had the Authority of God as his Plenipotentiary.* Where first, his account of a *Moral Union* is very extravagant; as if the being employed by another, would make him, for that reason, to be Morally one with him that employs him; but that Author is to be pardoned, who understands not the difference betwixt a Moral and Political Union. And again, he shewed himself not acquainted with the matter of Fact, when he saith the Heresie of *Nestorius* consisted in this, that he denied Christ to be united to the Word, otherwise than Morally; whereas St. *Cyril* saith, he granted that *Emanuel*, or Christ, *συνεστάναι καὶ ἀνατεπλήχθαι, was constituted and compounded of the Word of God, and an Intelligent Soul and a Body.* But then, saith he, he divided one Christ into Two; so that he that is born of the Virgin, is perfect man, and the other the Word of God; the one mere man, the other true God: The Word, the true and Eternal Son of God; but that which is born of the Virgin is equivocally the Son of God. Thus that Father.

Epist. Imper. Theod. n. 6. Concil. Tom. 4.

But he will say I am now better informed: Thanks to the *Answerer*,

ſwerer, who gently intimated to him, that he was out of the way; and to his Friend that has ſince ſet him in the right.

But after all, was there *not one word* in the Anſwer *as to the Unity of one Perſon, uniting theſe two Natures*? Let him but caſt his eye upon it again, and he will ſee this to be the Concluſion of the Argument, *Then there muſt be in him* (Chriſt) *two Natures united, which is the Incarnation.* If the Incarnation be the Union of two Natures in Chriſt, the Word, and this was rightly inferred from what went before; then what ſhall I ſay? Our Anthor has not dealt fairly with his Adverſary: And if this be to be a *Neſtorian*, then ſo was St. *Cyril*, ſo was the Council that condemned him; for ſo St. *Cyril* deſcribes the Incarnation, ἕνωσιν ἀσύγχυτον σάρκα ψυχὴν ἐχούσῃ τὴν λογικὴν; *when the Word was united to a Body informed by a Rational Soul.* Ad Monach. Ægypt. §. 12.

Q. 6. The *firſt* branch of this Queſtion is, What Scripture hath abſolved us from obeying one of the Commandments, which impoſes the keeping of *Saturday* holy? The *ſecond*, What Text of Scripture exacts of us the keeping holy (as the Lords day) the Sunday? Clear Proof.

Anſ. To the firſt part, not one word of Scripture; and for excuſe he tells us, That *there was no need of an expreſs abrogation*, becauſe *Sunday being ſet apart for the publick and ſolemn Worſhip of God, the Sabboth-day as well as the Holy-days and New-moons of the Jews, being a ſhadow, muſt ſurrender to the Sunday.* Here is as little Reaſon as Scripture; for the Sabboth did appertain to the Law of Nature, and was not a ſhadow only of a thing to come, but a memory of the paſt, and never-to-be-forgotten benefit of the *Creation*, from the work whereof God reſted on that day, and *bleſſed the ſeventh day.* Here 'tis pity at what a loſs the Anſwerer is to find the Chapter and Verſe wherein the abrogation of Circumciſion is clearly expreſt; 'Tis a charitable condeſcendency to inſtruct him; let him look then in *Gal.* 5. 2. where *behold* Paul *tells you*, that *if you be circumciſed, Chriſt ſhall profit you nothing.* Gen. 2. 3.

For the ſecond part, he produces a Text, *Rev.* 1. 10. *I was in ſpirit on the Lords day*; then he flouriſhes to teach us ignorant people, that *'tis uſual in Scripture, after that Times, Places, Things and Perſons were ſet apart for the ſervice of God by Divine Inſtitution, to have his Name as a mark of propriety given to them.* But in the name of ſenſe and reaſon, what means all this? There is a Lords day, no doubt; St. *John* was in ſpirit that day, 'tis certain; but the queſtion is, *What day of the week* was it? or was it only ſome peculiar day of the year, as *Eaſter-day*, or *Good-friday*? Hath he Scripture for this? Not one word. I find forty Texts that call the day of general Judgment, or that of each man's death, the *Lord's day*; but not one that mentions *Sunday* under that name. I find, *Act.* 2. 46. *how they that believed were* daily *continuing with one accord in the Temple, or breaking Bread from houſe to houſe*, but not a word of a day appointed for *ſtated* Aſſemblies.

Scripture failing our Adversary, he seeks supplies from Reason; but the misfortune is, that the first and chiefest he offers at, stands against him; *The Moral Sabbath* (says he) in the *Patriarchal* Church, and the *Ceremonial* in the *Jewish* Church, were on the days following the Creation and Deliverance from the Slavery of *Ægypt*. True, but what follows? Therefore 'tis not to be kept by Christians on the day in which Christ rested after he had accomplish'd our Redemption on the Cross by a solemn *Consummatum est*, and his precious Death? Not on *Saturday*? Raillery aside, what can be (I will not say more dull, but) spoken more directly in spight of sense and reason?

Vindication. Our Author for convenience to himself, has transposed the Questions; so that the first in the *Address*, is now the last. Let him quietly enjoy the benefit of it; I shall begin as he now begins.

Q. 1. *What Scripture hath absolved us from*, &c.

To this I gave, in short, a Threefold answer.

1. He requiring Chapter and Verse, I told him, *When he could find out Chapter and Verse for an express and clear abrogation of Circumcision, I would shew him Chapter and Verse for that of the Sabbath.* Here out of his abundant *charitable condescendency* he vouchsafes *to instruct* me, and hands me to *Gal.* 5. 2. *Where behold Paul tells you, that if you be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing.* And yet I do not find there is a *clear and express abrogation* of it. An Abrogation is a total abolition of it; and if it was abrogated so as that whoever was thereafter Circumcised, could have no profit by Christ; then all so Circumcised were in a state of Damnation. And here it would be fit to know when this abrogation did commence? For *Act.* 16. 3. we find *Paul* to Circumcise *Timothy*; and not long before St. *Paul*'s being a Prisoner, and being carried to *Rome*, the solemn Assembly declared that there *were many thousands* of the *Jewish* Christians which *were zealous of the Law*; and that St. *Paul* was reputed to be too forward in teaching *the Gentiles ought not to circumcise their children*, Act. 21. 20, 21. So that the Apostle's censure of it is not to be universally understood; but is only a preventing of their imposing it upon the Gentiles, and requiring it as necessary to Justification and Salvation. And of these that held it thus necessary, he saith, *If ye be circumcised*, upon these terms, *Christ shall profit you nothing*; *if ye are justified*, and expect justification *by the Law*, *ye are fallen from grace*, ver. 4.

2. I ſhewed there was no more a need of an expreſs abrogation of the Sabbath, than there was of the abrogation of Circumciſion; becauſe if the Lord's day was inſtituted, and which in the order of *the Anſwer* was firſt prov'd, the Sabbath muſt in reaſon ſurrender to it.

3. I ſhewed it from *Col.* 2. 16. where the Sabbath is ſaid to be a *ſhadow* of things to come, and ſo was to ceaſe by the coming of Chriſt, as the reſt of the ſame kind. He ſaith of this, *there is as little reaſon as Scripture*; but if there be as much reaſon as Scripture, he had no cauſe to complain: But he firſt takes care to leave out the Scripture, and then to exclaim, *not one Word of Scripture.* Well! what has he to ſay to *that little Reaſon* that there is? He ſaith, *The Sabboth did appertain to the Law of Nature, and was not a Shadow only of a thing to come, but a Memory* [he would ſay, a Memorial] *of the Creation.* But did it otherwiſe appertain to the Law of Nature, than as it was of Divine Inſtitution? Or, was it then ſo a Memorial of what was paſt, as not to be a Shadow of ſomewhat to come? Let him ſee how the Apoſtle applies it, *Heb.*4.9,10. But, ſuppoſe that it was a Memorial of the Creation (as it was) and a Shadow to the *Jews* (as he owns) then being both were but one and the ſame day, how could the Obſervation of the Sabbath be abrogated as a Shadow, and not alſo as a Memorial, ſince the ſame Day that was for the one, was alſo for the other? Thus we find there was a Patriarchal Circumciſion, and a Moſaical, as our Saviour ſhews, *John* 7. 22. And the queſtion then is, Whether the Abrogation of the Moſaical, was not alſo the Abrogation of the Patriarchal Circumciſion? And, whether what holds in the one, doth not hold in the other.

2*d* Branch, *What Text of Scripture exacts of us the keeping the Sunday holy?* Or what Scripture have we for the Divine Inſtitution of it?

As to this by way of Preparation, I

1. Gave a general Reaſon, which our Author for a little Advantage, has ſet laſt, and very unworthily abuſed.

I ſhall ſet them one againſt the other, before the Reader.

Anſwer.

Anſwer.

There is as much in the reaſon of the thing for this peculiar day to be obſerved in the Chriſtian Church, as there was for the Sabbath in the Patriarchal and Jewiſh Church; for what the Moral Sabbath was to Man upon his Creation; and the Ceremonial Sabbath was to the Jews upon their deliverance out of Egypt; *that is the firſt day of the Week, or the Lord's day to Chriſtians upon our Redemption by Chriſt, which was accompliſhed and teſtified in his Reſurrection on that day.*

Clear Proof.

The Moral Sabbath in the Patriarchal Church, and the Ceremonial in the Jewiſh Church, were on the days following the Creation and Deliverance from *Egypt*. Therefore 'tis not to be kept by Chriſtians on the day in which Chriſt reſted after he had accompliſhed our Redemption on the Croſs, by a Solemn *Conſummatum eſt*, and his precious Death? Not on Saturday?

And then he Triumphs, *What can be (I will not ſay more dull, but) ſpoken more directly in ſpight of Senſe and Reaſon?* And I will add, what can be more falſe, than what he here puts upon the *Anſwerer* (and that is ſomewhat a worſe Charge than *Dulneſs*) when in *ſpight* of honeſty, he ſhall thus manifeſtly pervert that which lay clear before him, into ridiculous Nonſenſe?

It's manifeſt, he has here nothing to ſay, unleſs he will ſay, there is not as much reaſon in the nature of the thing, for the Obſervation of one day in ſeven, in memory of our Redemption, as there was for it in the Creation, or the Deliverance out of *Egypt*.

2. I particularly proved it from the Mark of Divine Inſtitution ſet upon it, in the Name, the *Lord's day*, *Rev.* 1. 10. it being uſual in Scripture to have the Name of the Lord applied to Times, Places, Perſons and Things, when ſet apart by Divine Inſtitution.

To this he Replies.

The Queſtion is, *What day of the Week that was in the Revelation? Or, was it only ſome peculiar day of the year, as* Eaſter-day, *or* Good-Friday?

To which I Anſwer.

1. If

1. If the Name of the Lord be not without a reason applied to a Day, then it's evident that no day of the Week has any Colour or Pretence to it, but the First day.

2. It cannot be reasonably supposed to be *some peculiar day of the year*, as *Easter-day*, or *Good-Friday*.

(1.) Because we are certain, that the first day of the Week was observed in Apostolical times (as I shewed from Scripture) but we are not certain of these; there being not one word of Scripture, that looks that way. And when St. *Austin* saith of the Anniversary Observation of the days of Christ's Passion, Resurrection, Ascension, and the Descent of the Holy Ghost, that they *were observed in the whole World*; he adds, *it's to be believed such things so observed, were commanded and appointed by the Apostles, or General Councils*. He saith, it's to *be believed* they were appointed by one or the other; not being able to determine which; but we know that there was no General Council till above 300 years after Christ. Epist. 118.

(2.) *Easter-day* (which has the nearest pretence both in Reason and Antiquity) cannot be the Lord's day, because they were distinguished. So St. *Austin*, *We* (saith he) *solemnly celebrate the Lord's day, and* Easter. And the *Eastern* Churches, particularly, that of *Ephesus* (where St. *John* more especally was, did observe *Easter* according to the Moon, and not the day of the Week; and that so early, as *An.* 197. when *Polycrates* Bishop of *Ephesus*, and a Council of Bishops concurring with him, wrote to *Victor* Bishop of *Rome*, who threatned to Excommunicate them for it; that they feared him not, *for it was better to obey God than Man*. As for *Good-Friday*'s being the Lord's day, that I believe is a *Nostrum* of our Author's, as well as the Question put by him, is, *What day of the Week the Lords day is on?* Contr. Adimant. c. 16. Nova Collectio Concil. Baluz. p. 10.

2. He answers, *I find forty Texts that call the day of general Judgment, or that of each man's death, the Lords day, but not one that mentions Sunday under that name.* What follows? Therefore the Lord's day St. *John* was in the Spirit upon, was the day of Judgment or death, and not Sunday. But he will say this is a little too much; for the use he makes of this Observation, is to shew, that that day, whatever it was, might be called the *Lord's day*, and yet not be of Divine Institution. Very well: but yet I find the day of Judgment, (for indeed the day of death is not, as far as I remember, call'd the *Lord's day* in Scripture) to be of Divine Ordina-

Ordination: So *Matth.* 24. 36. and *Acts* 17. 31. *He hath appointed a day*; and is therefore a confirmation of what he would confute by it.

3. I offer'd further in proof of a Divine Inſtitution, That that day was conſecrated by the Deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt upon it. But to this he found nothing to reply.

4. I proved it from the obſervation of that day, and the Service celebrated upon it, *Act.* 20. 7. 1 *Cor.* 16. 2. What has he here to ſay? *I find*, Acts 2. 46. ſaith he, *how they that believed were daily continuing in the Temple; but not a word of a day appointed for ſolemn Aſſemblies.* What uſe can be made of this accurate Obſervation, and the ſtreſs he lays upon *daily*; What but this? The believers *daily* reſorted to the Temple, therefore they had no peculiar day; and ſo it follows moſt admirably, the *Jews daily* repaired to the Temple, therefore they had no peculiar day, no Sabbath. But he finds *not a word of a day appointed for ſtated Aſſemblies*, no not ſo much as Acts 20. 7. *&c.* quoted and inſiſted on in the *Anſwer*.

Having thus diſmiſs'd the third queſtion of the *Anſwer*, with all the ſupernumerary Queſtions collected out of it by *the Prover*; I went to look for Queſtion the fourth, as it is in *the Anſwer*, and put by the *Addreſſer*; and that is, *Whether it be neceſſary to ſalvation for him to believe the Trinity and Incarnation, that cannot find them clearly expreſs'd in Scripture, though he reads it ſincerely, and with humility.* But of this, not a word. We *may gueſs at the reaſon without caſting a figure.* However, it's a little more honeſt to omit a Paragraph, than it is to pervert it. The former is an implicit acknowledgment of Truth, the latter is a renouncing it.

Clear Proof. Q. 7. *Am I bound to believe* (the ſenſe given to a doubtful Text) *becauſe my Guides tell me I muſt do ſo?*

Anſ. No, plainly No: And he hath two Texts for it; the firſt, 2 *Cor.* 1. 24. *Not for that we have dominion over your Faith, but are helpers*, ſays St. *Paul*; and *Mat.* 23. 8. *Call no man Maſter on earth, for one is your Maſter.* Here not only the Walls of the City of God are broken down, but the very Foundations (of *Prophets* and *Apoſtles*) are digg'd up; is it all St. *Paul* could do, all you allow him, to give *ſome light, ſome helps*, when his Proſelytes had any doubt about the ſenſe of Scripture? Were they not oblig'd to believe the Senſe and Interpretation *He* gave to the Text? Then that Faith is vain which was founded on the Apoſtles Preaching, and all Chriſtianity ſtands on a wrong bottom.

Here

Here our Author is guilty of another omission; For the *Answerer* exhibited a five-fold Charge against him of Fallacy and Colluſion, which he has taken no manner of care to clear himſelf of; but ſuffers it to remain in its full force againſt himſelf. *Vindication.*

He has indeed proceeded otherwiſe in this laſt Queſtion; For whereas before in the *Addreſs* he ſet up a Guide that is a Judge, whom it's neceſſary ſo to believe, and to ſubmit to, as to receive from him ſuch Neceſſaries to Salvation as are not contained in Scripture, and the ſenſe of ſuch Neceſſaries as are not clearly contained in it; he now in the *proof* ſoftens, and extenuates, and expounds, and the Queſtion now is reduced to this, *Am I bound to believe the Senſe given to doubtful Texts, becauſe my Guide tells me I muſt do ſo?* This indeed may better ſerve his purpoſe, but after all is neither true in it ſelf, nor can be accommodated to his former notion of a Guide, and the authority given to him. For what has doubtful Texts to do with the Caſe, where there are no Texts concerned? What has a Senſe given to Scripture, to do with a Caſe which is to be determined without Scripture; As it is in Neceſſaries not contained in Scripture, and which we are to learn from our Guide, that we are *bound to follow?*

But ſuppoſing we take his Expoſition, that this is when the *Texts* be *doubtful*; yet the Things thoſe Texts are ſuppoſed to be concerned in, are Things neceſſary to Salvation; and ſo to believe a Guide *abſolutely*, as to *the ſenſe of a doubtful Text*, is equivalent to the believing him where there is no Text pretended. Since the Perſon in doubt is no more aſſur'd of the ſenſe of theſe Texts in a Point neceſſary, than he was without a Text. For when there is no Text for a thing neceſſary, he abſolutely relies upon his Guide, who tells him, it is neceſſary: And when there is a *ſenſe given to a doubtful* Text, he *believes* that ſenſe, becauſe his Guide tells him that is the ſenſe of it, and ſo he ſtill relies upon his Guide; and his Faith is thus immediately reſolved into the Guide.

And it ſeems this the *Anſwerer* doth deny, and that upon the Authority of our Saviour, who diſallows it, *Mat.* 23. 8. and the Apoſtle who diſclaims it, 2 *Cor.* 1. 24. But here our Author is beſide all patience, and anſwers it with a dreadful Exclamation. *Here, not only the Walls of the City of God are broken down, but the very Foundations of Prophets and Apoſtles are digg'd up.* And why

ſo? becauſe we will not admit a Guide of their own Impoſition, in defiance of our Saviour's and St. *Paul*'s prohibition to the contrary. But O, ſaith our Author, *Is it all St.* Paul *could do, all you allow him, to give ſome light, ſome helps, when his Proſelytes had any doubt about the Senſe of Scripture? Were they not obliged to believe the Senſe and Interpretation he gave to the Text? Then*, &c.

Here *the Prover* is either confounded in his own thoughts, or intends to confound and amuſe his Reader. The Opinion he maintains is, That in matters of doubt, a Perſon doubting is to be abſolutely concluded by his Guide; *I am to believe*, ſaith he, *becauſe my Guides tell me I muſt do ſo.* Now he would have it, that to deny this Authority to the Apoſtles, is to allow them only to give *ſome light, ſome helps*, that is, (as I conceive he means) to make them no more than Common Teachers. But I ſhall endeavour, if it may be, to ſet our Author right in this matter. Toward which it's to be obſerved,

1. That there is an abſolute and ſovereign Authority in the Church, which all are bound to follow, believe and obey, without any diſpute, and that Authority is ſoly the prerogative of our Saviour, and which no man, or ſociety of men can claim, *Mat.* 23. 8, 9.

2. There is a ſubordinate Authority, which is immediately derived from him; and this was peculiar to inſpired Perſons, and is extraordinary. So the Apoſtle ſaith of himſelf, *Gal.* 1. 11, 12. *The Goſpel which was preached of me, is not after man; For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it but by the Revelation of Jeſus Chriſt.* But as ſuch Perſons were ſent, ſo they were able to prove their Commiſſion and their Doctrine to be received from Chriſt: And they did not require any to believe them, becauſe they told them they were their Guides, and they muſt believe them, *becauſe they tell them ſo*; (for that was to have *dominion* over their Faith) but they appealed to the Scriptures, to their Miraculous Gifts; 2 *Cor.* 12. 12. and encouraged their Auditors to try and examine their Doctrines; *Acts* 17. 11. *Gal.* 1. 8, 9. And this way of trying is ſo far from making Faith *Vain* (as our Author pretends) that it would be vain without it.

But, ſaith he, *Were not the Proſelytes of St.* Paul *obliged to believe the Senſe and Interpretation he gave to the Text?* Without doubt; but then he did not require them to receive and believe it, becauſe

he

be told them ſo, but becauſe it was revealed, and that they beforehand were ſatisfied in the Confirmation he brought of his Apoſtleſhip. For where there was a new Revelation of any Point to be believed, or matter to be done, being that could not be any farther examined by Scripture than as it was not contrary to it, it wholly was to be reſolved into his Miſſion; and they had the ſame reaſon to believe his Doctrine, as his Miſſion.

3. There is another ſort of ſubordinate Authority, which receives both its Miſſion and Doctrine in an ordinary way: And therefore muſt needs be ſubject to the like ways of tryal and proof as the former. But with this difference, that what inſpired Perſons taught as revealed from God, that upon proof of their Miſſion by Miracles, 2 *Cor.* 12. 12. was to be believed: but now when we have only ordinary means, and the written Word for our Rule, there is no other Doctrine to be received, than what is contained in that Rule, and ſo neither can they oblige us, nor are we obliged to believe them, becauſe they tell us ſo, but as it's conſonant with, or contained in, or rightly inferred from the Scripture, which we are to compare it with, and to judge of it by.

But now our Author makes their Guides not only equal, but ſuperior to the Apoſtles, when he tells us, We *are bound to believe them, becauſe they themſelves tell us ſo*; and that without any examination. So that if a man miſtakes his Guide, or his Guide miſtakes, he muſt unavoidably miſtake alſo, being wholly to be determined by them. And then he muſt be an *Arian* with the Popes *Felix* and *Liberius*, a *Neſtorian* with *Anaſtaſius*, a *Monothelite* with *Honorius*, and deny the immortality of the Soul with *John* XXIII. And now let any judg *where the Foundations of the Prophets and Apoſtles are digg'd up*; whether in the Reformed Churches, that teach us we are not bound to believe any Guide, without tryal of their Doctrine; or the Church of *Rome*, which, with our Author, affirms *we are bound to believe our Guides, becauſe they tell us we muſt do ſo.*

Now our Anſwerer takes his turn to ask Queſtions. He tells us that for the firſt he has a *pinching one*: 'Tis this; *If I muſt know the Church by ſome marks or notes, then I muſt find theſe marks firſt; and where muſt I ſeek them?* This is pinching indeed! Suppoſe in a *Gazette* I ſhould find ſome marks of a Man that is ſought for, were it not a ſevere Objection Clear Proof.

ction againſt the Man who gave them, and a pinching Queſtion, *I muſt find theſe Marks before I find the man; and where ſhall I find them?* I conceive ſuch *pinching* would force a ſmile, and this Anſwer, *Why Friend, the marks and the man are found at once, for they are to be ſeen in his Face.* At the ſame time as one takes a view of the Catholic Church, he ſees therein a continual Succeſſion of Biſhops and Teachers from the Apoſtles; he diſcovers her in all parts of the World, and finds her thus *Catholic*; he ſees in her an undivided Faith, Union under one Paſtor in the uſe of the ſame Sacraments, and finds her *One*; he obſerves her Rule is, *Let nothing be alter'd* of what was receiv'd from the Apoſtles by a conſtant Univerſal *Tradition* in the Churches which they founded, and is convinced ſhe is *Apoſtolical*; he finds God favours her with the Gift of *Miracles*, promiſed *Mat.* 10. and *Joh.* 14. that ſhe hath fulfilled the Propheſies concerning the *Converſion of Nations*, converted to Chriſtianity by her Children only; and he concludes this is ſhe.

Vindication. The *Prover* ſaith that, *Now the Anſwerer takes his turn to ask Queſtions.* And good reaſon, after the *Addreſſer* had put ſo many before. He tells us further, That *for the firſt he has a pinching one.* 'Tis this, *If I muſt know the Church by ſome Marks, then I muſt find out thoſe Marks firſt; and where muſt I ſeek them?* But, why is this called the *firſt* Queſtion, when there are ſeveral before it? He might better have called it the only Queſtion, ſince it's what he has ſingled out of many to try the power of his Logic upon. And now let us ſee how he quits himſelf, when he comes to be Reſpondent. His Anſwer to the Queſtion, is, *Suppoſe in a Gazette, &c. and the Marks, and the Man are found at once, for they are to be ſeen in his Face.* Where his whole buſineſs is to go off from the Queſtion that is ask'd, to a Queſtion that is not ask'd. The main Queſtion in the *Anſwer* was, *How ſhall I find out the true Church?* Is it becauſe She her ſelf ſo declares? Or that She is knowable by a ſelf-evident Light? Or is She to be found out by Marks? If by Marks, then we muſt find out the Marks before we find out the Church, which is to be known by thoſe Marks; and then the pinching Queſtion comes on; *Where muſt I ſeek them? That, it's to be fear'd, will lead us to the Scriptures.* Now what is the Senſe of the Queſtion, *Where muſt I ſeek them?* Certainly, it is not in diſpute, whether the Marks are not to be found in the thing ſought for, by thoſe Marks (as he impertinently lays it) For if they are the proper Marks of the thing; then, ſurely, they are to be found with the thing that they

they are the Marks of; or elſe it is impoſſible to find out the thing by theſe Marks. But the meaning of the Queſtion is the ſame as it was in the *Addreſs*, (and from whence the *Anſwerer* borrowed the Terms) and that is, Where are the Notes? Where are they deſcribed? Or, How ſhall I come to know them? And thus it follows in the *Anſwer*, *It is to be feared, this will lead us to the Scripture.* But becauſe ſome men are hard of Underſtanding, whether for a weak or a bad reaſon, I determine not, I ſhall begin the matter again. It is agreed, that there is a Church, and that there are certain Marks by which the Church may be found: Now the Queſtion is, What are thoſe Marks? Whether *Continual Succeſſion, Univerſal Extent, Union under one Viſible Paſtor*, &c.? Or, *The Profeſſion of the true Faith, right Adminiſtration of the Sacraments*?

Now how ſhall we know, or where ſhall we find, which of theſe are the Marks belonging to the Church, and by which it is to be known?

I ſhall make it plain by his own inſtance; Suppoſing that there is ſomewhat of great Importance depends upon finding out a particular perſon; and that he that would find him out, knows not the man, but for his better direction applies himſelf to one that knows ſomewhat of this matter, and asks him, *Sir*, How ſhall I find out ſuch a Man, or where may I ſeek the Marks by which he may be diſcover'd? Would it not *force a Smile* to have this Anſwer? Do you ask that? *Why Friend, the Marks and the Man are found at once, for they are to be ſeen in his Face.* Would he not be made much the Wiſer, by this grave Reply; and forthwith be able to find out the Man he ſeeks for, by this goodly Direction? Or would he not ſay, *Sir*, I came not to be informed of that which every one that is not a ſtark Fool underſtands as well as your Worſhip; but I would know, what are thoſe Marks which *are to be ſeen in his Face*, and by which I may know him from your ſelf, or any other, and where are they deſcrib'd? And will not the other, if he be able and willing to inform him, then tell him, the Marks are in the *Gazette*, and there you may find them. Now, which is to be found out firſt, the Marks or the Man? And what are thoſe Marks, and *where muſt I ſeek them*? Surely it needs no Application. As for his Triumphant Marks of the Church, he may find them

them answered to purpose in the Book not long since published upon that Argument.

Clear Proof. 'Tis also observable at what a distance these men are from the true Church, who conceive it so hard to find her out. All holy Fathers ever judged it a most easy thing to each Person, insomuch that the Holy Doctor St. *Augustin* thus delivers his Sense of it: *I tell you with truth, Brethren, the Prophets have spoken* more obscurely *of Christ, than of the Church; I believe, because they saw in Spirit, that men would make* Sects *against the Church, but would not be so much divided about Christ.* But 'tis natural for a Crimnal to question the Power of his Judge; and these men know it hath ever been the Sense of all Christians, which St. *Augustin* expresst in the following Words; *There is no Salvation out of the Church, who doubts of it? Therefore whatever you have from the Church (Scripture, Creed,* Sacraments, *&c) help you not to Salvation out of the Church, whether you believe contrary to the Truth, or being divided from the Unity, gather not with Christ; whence St.* Paul *says to Heretics, Those who do such things, shall not possess the Kingdom of Heaven.*

Cc. 2. in Psal. 30.

De Unit. Eccl. l 4. c. 8.

Gal. 5.

Vindication. He saith, *'Tis observable at what a distance Men are from the true Church, who conceive it so hard to find it out.* But our distance from the true Church, is not the more, because we *conceive it so hard to find* her out in their way, and by such Marks (which if there are no other) it's impossible to find her out by. But now, if we go in St. *Austins* way, then it's not difficult, for thus he determines it. *The weak seeks for the Church. The wandring seeks for the Church. I inquire after the Voice of the Pastor. Read this to me out of the Prophet, and read it out of the* Psalms; *recite it from the Law, the Gospel, the Apostle.* Look for it in the Scripture, and there you will find it.

De Pastore, c. 14.

Here the *Prover* cites a Passage out of St. *Austin*, which I am confident he did not read there. For (1.) he quotes the 4*th* Book of St. *Austin*, *de Unitate*, whereas there is but one Book in all. (2.) There are several mistakes in the Quotation it self. As he saith, *There is no Salvation out of the Church, who doubts of it?* Whereas the Words of St. *Austin* are, *Qui autem super arenam ædificant* [*i. e.* qui audiunt Verba & non faciunt, *as just before*] *quis dubitaverit, quod regnum Dei non possidebunt?* That is, *But those who build upon the sand, who doubts that they shall not possess the Kingdom of Heaven?* Again the *Prover* reads it, *Whatever you have from the Church (Scripture, Creed, Sacraments, &c.) help you*

you not to Salvation out of the Church. Whereas there is nothing of this, but it follows after what was said *of the builders on the sand*, Nihil utique prodest Baptismi Sacramentum, that is, *So that the Sacrament of Baptism profits not such.* And then he quotes that of St. *Paul*, *Those which do such things*, &c. without that other Insertion of his, *Whether you believe contrary to the Truth*, &c. The matters are not much material; but by this the Reader may judg what a careless, injudicious, or confident (to say no worse) Adversary I have to deal with.

His other Queries have no difficulty, and withal so little of Sense, that I shall not offer to force my Readers Attention on them. Clear Proof.

Whether the other Queries had any *Sense*, I shall leave to others to judg; but however, because they may not be so easie to others, as to himself, it is to be wished he had shewed a little more of his *good Nature*, and *Condescendency*, to have resolved them. I shall try once again, whether I can make sense of them, and leave him to try whether he can answer them: If they are not Sense, they are not to be understood, and so there can be no hurt to Propose them: If they *have no difficulty*, they are the easier and the sooner answered. *Vindication.*

The Queries Propounded in the *Answer*, and yet remaining to be resolved, are these.

Q. 1. What those Necessaries to Salvation are, that are not contained in Scripture, and where each of them is to be found?

Q. 2. Whether the Articles of Pope *Pius*'s Creed joined to the *Nicene* Creed, are as clearly to be proved from Scripture, as those of the *Nicene* Creed; or that those of the *Nicene* Creed are no more to be proved from Scripture, than those of Pope *Pius*?

Q. 3. Whether it's as necessary to believe the Church of *Rome* is the Mother and Mistress of all Churches, and the Pope to be the Vicar of Christ, and all the other Articles of that Creed, of Pope *Pius*, as it is to believe that our Lord Jesus was Incarnate, and the rest of the Articles of the *Nicene* Creed?

Q. 4.

Q. 4. Which has the first and Supreme Authority, the Scripture or the Church?

Q. 5. Whether the Church can ordain new Articles of Faith, and which when so ordained, are as much to be received and believed, as those which have their Authority immediately from Scripture?

Q. 6. Which is to be sought for first, the Notes, or the Church that is to be found out by these Notes? If the Church, then how shall I know it? If the Notes, where must I seek them?

Q. 7. If the Church be to be an Infallible Guide, when it's found out; then what is the Guide that will infallibly lead to the Church? And whether is that Guide to be sought for within the Church, or without it?

Q. 8. Whether we may be infallibly certain out of the Church; or how we can find out the Church infallibly, if the Church alone be infallible, and that we cannot be infallibly certain till we come into the Church?

Q. 9. Where is the Seat of Infallibility in the Church, whether in every particular Person, or the Supreme Pastor, or a General Council? And whether they all agree in this matter?

Q. 10. Whether what they disagree in can be the *Sentiment* of the whole Church; or that we are bound to believe what they cannot agree in?

Q. 11. Whether we are any more bound to believe the Infallibility of their Church, which they thus disagree in, than the *Address* would perswade us we are not obliged to believe the Trinity, because the *Arians*, tho *Christians*, *deny it*?

Q. 12. How one at a vast distance of Time or Place, can be infallibly assured of the Certainty of those Decrees which are said to proceed from an Infallible Power; or that he can be any

any more certain of the Truth, Certainty, and Sense of these, than he can be of the Truth, Authority, and Sense of Scripture?

Q. 13. Whether our Saviour has not spoken as plainly and intelligibly in Scripture, as his pretended Vicar, or their Councils have done in their Decrees and Canons?

Q. 14. Whether, when the Persons that publish or give the Sense of those Decrees and Canons are Fallible, a Person can be infallibly certain that these are the very Decrees, or that the true Sense of them? Or whether a Person in these Circumstances can be any more certain, tho a Member of an Infallible Church, than another may be, that is a Member of a Fallible Church?

Q. 15. Whether, for example, we can be any more certain that there ever was such a Pope as Pope *Pius*, or that ever there was such a Creed drawn up by him, or that this or that is an Article, or the Sense of it, than we are that the Scriptures are the Word of God, and that the Doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation are clearly contained in them?

These are the Questions in the *Answer*, and which I have drawn out in order; I hope they shew themselves to be *Sense*; it remains to the *Prover* to shew they have *no difficulty* to be resolved.

All well-meaning Protestants finding that Scripture interpreted the *Protestant-way* is so far from being an easie and clear Rule of Faith, that a Protestant in the Answer to an Address made to the Ministers of the Church of *England*, approved by a Chaplain to the highest Ecclesiastical Authority under the King, cannot as much as teach by it the first Principles of Christian Religion; will seek a better method of using that *Divine Rule*, and not be hereafter so easily imposed upon by those Guides who give them but their own *private fancies*, under the Veil and Name of the *Word of God*. I was (I confess) surprized to find *Guil. Needham*, &c. approving this Answer; but God and Truth are of our side; *Et inimici nostri sunt Judices*; the weakness of our Opposers Arguments bear a proof to it. Clear Proof.

Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam.

Vindication. I may now leave the case to *all well-meaning Protestants*; for who that is of that number, or indeed is impartial, but may soon discern, who they are that make the Scripture a *Rule of Faith*; Whether those that resolve all Necessaries to Salvation wholly into it, or those that join Tradition with it in Esteem and Authority? They may again as soon discern, Whether the Scripture be *Easie* and *Clear*, and best understood in the Protestant *Method*, when it's Translated for Vulgar use in the Mother Tongue, and the People are allowed and exhorted to read it; or in the Popish *Method*, when it's kept in an unknown Tongue, or if Translated, not permitted to be read by them? Whether again They feed them with *their own private Fancies*, that teach the people nothing but what both Teacher and Hearer learn from Scripture; or they that make things necessary to be believed and done, which are not contained in Scripture?

I find our *Author surpriz'd* to find *Guil. Needham, a Chaplain to the highest Ecclesiastical Authority under the King* (we know who they are that set up an *Ecclesiastical* Authority above the King) *to approve the Answer.* But why so surprized? When it's likely *G. N.* was as confident as *the Prover* could be on his own, that *God and Truth* are on the Answerer's *side*; and perhaps might have a good opinion of his Performance, though I grant, it's likely, not as good as our Author hath of his own *Clear Proof.*

An Answer to Dr. *Sherlock's* Preservative.

Here I should have ended, but it seems the poor *Answer* has met with another Adversary, one (as he himself tells us) that *at a full, mixed Assembly in the City so laid it open, that most of the Protestants there ashamed of it, found no better Salvo than to disown the Answerer as an Ignorant Scribler, who had betrayed his Cause.* I wish this successful Undertaker had but given us a Breviate of the Case as he propounded it to that *Assembly*; for if he managed it in the same way as his Friend *the Prover* has done, or as he himself has answered the *Preservative*, sometimes omitting, sometimes mangling, and at all times Misrepresenting his Adversaries Arguments, I will for once excuse my Friends the Protestants, if they then thought the *Answerer* worthy of no better a Character than is here related; tho I hope for the future they will have less reason to believe an Adversary; and use that kind of liberty, which

which the Churh of *Rome* so much envies them, and belongs to them as Men and as Christians, and judg for themselves, by seeing with their own eyes, whether the Cause is maintained or *betrayed*. But after all, I know not whether I may not have as little reason to believe him concerning these Protestants, as they had to believe him concerning the *Answer*.

FINIS.

THE Incurable Scepticiſm of the Church of *Rome*. By the Author of the [*Six Conferences concerning the Euchariſt.*] 4°.

Mr *Pulton* Conſidered in his Sincerity, Reaſonings, Authorities: Or a Juſt Anſwer to what he hath hitherto publiſhed in his *True Account*; his *True and Full Account of a Conference*, &c. His *Remarks*; and in them his pretended Confutation of what he calls Dr. T's *Rule of Faith*. By *Th. Tenison*, D. D.

A Full View of the Doctrines and Practices of the *Ancient Church* relating to the *Euchariſt*, wholly different from thoſe of the *Preſent Roman Church*, and inconſiſtent with the belief of *Tranſubſtantiation*. Being a ſufficient Confutation of *Conſenſus Veterum*, *Nubes Teſtium*, and other late *Collections* of the *Fathers* pretending to the Contrary. 4°.

An Anſwer to the *Repreſenter's* Reflections upon the *State* and *View* of the Controverſy; With a Reply to the Vindicator's Full Anſwer, ſhewing that the Vindicator has utterly ruin'd the New Deſign of *Expounding* and *Repreſenting* Popery. 4°.

An Anſwer to the Popiſh Addreſs preſented to the Miniſters of the Church of *England*, 4°.

An Abridgment of the Prerogatives of St. *Ann*, Mother of the Mother of God, with the Approbations of the Doctors of *Paris*, thence done into Engliſh, with a PREFACE concernining the Original of the Story.

The Primitive Fathers no Papiſts, in Anſwer to the *Nubes Teſtium*; to which is added, a Diſcourſe concerning *Invocation of Saints*, in Anſwer to the Challenge of *F. Segran* the Jeſuit; wherein is ſhewn, that Invocation of Saints was ſo far from being the Practice, that it was expreſly againſt the Doctrine of the Primitive Fathers. 4°.

An Anſwer to a Diſcourſe concerning the Celibacy of the Clergy, lately Printed at *Oxford*. 4°.

The *Virgin Mary* Miſrepreſented by the *Roman* Church, In the Traditions of that Church concerning her Life and Glory, and in the Devotions paid to her as the Mother of God. Both ſhewed out of the Offices of that Church, the Leſſons on her Feſtivals, and from their allowed Authors.

Dr. *Tenisons* Sermon of Diſcretion in giving Alms. 12°.

A Diſcourſe concering the Merits of Good Works.

The Enthuſiaſm of the Church of *Rome*, demonſtrated in ſome Obſervations upon the Life of *Ignatius Loyola*, (Founder of the Order of Jeſus).

A Vindication of the Anſwer to the Popiſh Addreſs preſented to the Miniſters of the Church of *England*. 4°.

Reflections upon the Books of the Holy Scripture, in order to eſtabliſh the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion, in 3 Parts. 8vo. *In the Preſs.*

The *Texts* which the *Papiſts* cite out of the *Bible* for Proof of the Points of their Religion, *Examin'd*, and ſhew'd to be alledged without Ground. In ſeveral diſtinct Diſcourſes, *Five whereof are publiſhed*, viz.

Popery not founded in Scripture. The Introduction.
Texts concerning the Obſcurity of Holy Scripture.
—— Of the Inſufficiency of Scripture, and Neceſſity of Tradition.
—— Of the Supremacy of St. *Peter*, and the Pope, over the whole Church. *In Two Parts.*
—— Of Infallibility.

The Reſt will follow Weekly, in their Order.

30304 1